

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 139 072

EA 009 472

TITLE The Long-Range Educational Facility Plan for the Minneapolis Public Schools. Section I.
 INSTITUTION Minneapolis Citywide Joint Advisory Educational Facilities Committee, Minn.; Minneapolis Public Schools, Minn.
 PUB DATE 30 Nov 76
 NOTE 44p.
 EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Building Conversion; Capital Outlay (for Fixed Assets); Community Resources; Educational Finance; *Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Environmental Influences; Facility Guidelines; *Facility Planning; Facility Requirements; Flexible Facilities; *Master Plans; School Integration; *School Planning; Shared Facilities; Shared Services
 IDENTIFIERS *Minnesota (Minneapolis)

ABSTRACT

This plan was presented to the Minneapolis Board of Education as an informational report. The plan proposes long-range educational goals and the procedures and criteria for making school building decisions, presents the school-related components of the long-range comprehensive plan for the city, provides physical plant data for the schools and other building facilities of the Minneapolis Public Schools, and discusses fiscal resources for long-range capital outlay needs. The plan is general and goal-oriented in nature. It provides the base for specific courses of action that are detailed in other middle and short-range plans. Because of the implications of new requirements made by the state legislature, this plan is considered an initial document and further elaboration is expected in the future. (Author/MLF)

 * Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
 * materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
 * to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
 * reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
 * of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
 * via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
 * responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
 * supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED139072

EA 009 472

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SECTION I

THE LONG-RANGE EDUCATIONAL FACILITY PLAN

FOR THE

MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Prepared By

Minneapolis Citywide Joint Advisory Educational Facilities Committee

Reviewed and Approved by the Board of Education on
November 30, 1976



MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

807 NORTHEAST BROADWAY, MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55413

Telephone 612/348-6084

RAYMOND G. ARVESON
Superintendent of Schools

TO THE PATRONS OF SPECIAL SCHOOL DISTRICT #1,
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA:

The Long-Range Educational Facilities Plan for the Minneapolis Public Schools was prepared by the Minneapolis Citywide Joint Advisory Educational Facilities Committee, and was presented to the Board of Education as an informational report on May 11, 1976. The Plan proposes long-range educational goals and the procedures and criteria for making school building decisions, presents the school-related components of the long-range comprehensive plan for the city, provides physical plant data for the schools and other building facilities of the Minneapolis Public Schools, and discusses fiscal resources for long-range capital outlay needs.

The Plan is comprehensive, forward-looking and sound. An extensive amount of time, thought and work was put into the development of the Long-Range Plan by a group of dedicated Minneapolis citizens with the resource assistance of the School District's Planning Department. The Long-Range Plan is general and goal-oriented in nature. It provides the base for specific courses of action which are detailed in the Facility Committee's Middle and Short-Range Plans.

A number of additional planning requirements that should be included and considered in the Facilities Plan are just now being placed upon the School District. As a result of the last legislative session it will now be necessary to develop a planning, evaluating and reporting (PER) plan as well as a comprehensive long-range Facilities Plan for the Metropolitan Council. PER will require a restatement of the District goals and objectives which should then be incorporated in the Facilities Plan and other School District plans. The Citizens' Facilities Committee Long-Range Plan will most likely need to be expanded in the light of these new requirements. The suggestions received from the City Planning Commission staff will be continually reviewed in the context of the developing Facilities Plan. Because of the implications of these new requirements for planning, it should be noted that the Citizens' Committee Plan is an excellent initial document and further elaboration should be expected in the future.

Very sincerely,

Raymond G. Arveson
Superintendent of Schools

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I

THE RECOMMENDED LONG-RANGE EDUCATIONAL FACILITY PLAN

	<u>Page</u>
List of Tables, Maps, Charts	I-4
I. Introduction	I-5
II. School District Long-Range Educational Goal Statements and Rationale	I-6
III. Procedures and Criteria for Making School Building Decisions	I-16
IV. Physical Plant Data	I-18
V. Fiscal Resources for Long-Range Capital Outlay Needs	I-23
INFORMATIONAL ATTACHMENTS:	
A - Facility Evaluation Form	I-27
B - The Long-Range Comprehensive Plan for the City	I-30

LIST OF TABLES, MAPS, CHARTS

(SECTION I)

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE 1 - Physical Plant Data - Elementary Schools	I-19
TABLE 2 - Physical Plant Data - Junior High and Middle Schools	I-21
TABLE 3 - Physical Plant Data - Senior High Schools	I-22
TABLE 4 - Estimates of Building Fund Income Through 1979	I-26

SECTION I

THE LONG-RANGE EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES PLAN

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of these reports is to outline a recommended educational facilities plan for the public schools of Minneapolis. The report is divided into three sections: Long-Range, Middle-Range and Short Term.

The charge (from the Board of Education) to the Citywide Joint Advisory Educational Facilities Committee was as follows:

"The primary task of the Citizens' Advisory Committee is to develop a recommended long term educational facility plan, rather than deal with day to day building maintenance problems."

"The educational facilities plan is to be developed in three continuous and sequential steps--(1) A Long Range Educational Facilities Plan, (2) A Middle Range Plan, and (3) A Short Term or Immediate Building Program. Parts (1) and (2) will be conceptual and will include the "planning information system" and major building programs, while part (3) will contain annual, immediate and emergency school building recommendations."

"All sections of the plan will require continuous review and revision as needed."¹

This Section I includes the recommended long-range educational facility plan. Sections II and III will be presented at a later date.

¹Minneapolis Board of Education, "A Plan for Planning Educational Facility Needs for Minneapolis", March, 1975, pp. 3 and 12.

II. SCHOOL DISTRICT LONG-RANGE GOAL STATEMENTS AND RATIONALE

It is necessary that educational facilities planning be consistent with the educational goals of the Minneapolis Public Schools. Educational goals are developed by staff in coordination with community with the assistance and approval of the Board of Education. After months of extensive study, review and analysis, the citywide facilities committee has developed the following long-range goal statements that carry facility implications. Statements in italics are those facility implications that the committee wishes to emphasize.

A. COMPREHENSIVE METRO-CITY-SCHOOL PLANNING GOALS:

- GOAL #1. The School District Should Have A System That Is Compatible With Land Usage And Capital Improvement Plans Of Other Local Governments And School Districts Within The Metropolitan Area.

While it is desirable to avoid duplication of facilities among and within the city's public and private agencies, it is of near equal importance to develop and use a system of cooperative planning with other municipalities and school districts within the metropolitan area. This is an important concept and strong efforts should be made in this area.

While it may seem idealistic to think that all land usage and facilities will be compatible among the various agencies, this is nevertheless a goal toward which the agencies should strive for achievement through good communication and cooperative planning. Land for building is at a premium throughout the metropolitan area and optimum utilization is essential. The concurrent shrinking and expanding of populations in contiguous areas make it essential to be aware of and take into consideration the building programs of other public entities. Coordination will achieve the most benefits for the greatest economy in public service programs.

- GOAL #2. The School District Should Plan Facilities That Comply As Closely As Possible With The Long-Range Comprehensive Municipal Plan.

The comprehensive plan is the only document that exists in the city which addresses the total spectrum of human needs. It serves as the linking document between various agencies and levels of government and should serve as

(II. Long-Range Goals - cont'd)

the foundation for individual agency efforts in meeting the needs of individuals and communities. Since the comprehensive plan is updated from time to time, it should be reviewed periodically by the Board of Education.

GOAL #3. The School District Should Cooperate With Other Public And Private Agencies In Planning Joint Use Of Facilities.

To make the most efficient use of limited funds within our community, a process for joint planning and cooperation should be established. Such a process will avoid duplication of facilities and services. The parties to the planning process should include public and private non-profit agencies in the business of serving the public need. A most essential element of the planning process is early communication in order to develop cooperation at all stages of planning.

The possibility of each school becoming a human resource center should be explored and space made available for community agencies (public and private) to offer services within the school. As joint plans for the development and utilization of school facilities as human resource centers are made, plans must include provisions for K-12 program compatibility, cooperative funding of construction, remodeling, and for the ongoing operational expenses of the multiple services facilities. Convertible or flexible building facilities may have a higher initial cost, and consideration should be given to joint-agency funding of this initial expense.

GOAL #4. The School District Should Develop Facilities That Can Be Converted So That They Might Accommodate Non-Educational Uses, If Necessary.

At least a dozen older elementary schools in Minneapolis have been discontinued during 1975 and 1976. In a number of instances, community members and organizations have evaluated the possibility of using some of these buildings to house "other than school" activities. Every

(II. Long-Range Goals - cont'd)

building so evaluated was rejected because of either the high cost of conversion or the impossibility to convert to alternative use. Load-bearing walls, spaces frozen to a particular size, lack of satisfactory standards for health and life safety, insufficient parking areas, poor mechanical and heating systems and high operating costs were the conditions that most frequently discouraged "alternative" usage.

It is recognized by the committee that schools are constructed primarily as learning centers for students and must be designed to accommodate the teaching-learning situation. However, during periods of fluctuating enrollments, program changes and efforts at integration/desegregation, certain schools -- possibly newer ones -- may need to be used temporarily to house activities other than educational. Alternative non-educational uses of school facilities should be determined in coordination with community. Our schools should be able to be converted readily to such uses and back to school use when necessary. Although, a number of convertible buildings exist in the school system, we would note the convertibility potential now existing at Seward and Putnam as being excellent examples.

The potential for use of available space in existing school buildings by other public and voluntary agencies should be explored, particularly in schools which are desirable for continued operation rather than closure.

GOAL #5. The School District Should Provide An Educational Program That Makes Broad Use Of Community Resources.

Rapid social and technological change characterizes modern society. The rate of change should be expected to accelerate even further in the future. Public education has tended to be tradition bound and has reacted slowly to change, particularly social change. If students are to survive and thrive in our society, they must be fully exposed to learning resources available in the community. The school of the future must be designed to facilitate the influx of community resources and allow students opportunity to learn outside the school building.

(II. Long-Range Goals - cont'd)

The Minneapolis Schools should work closely with other agencies, public and private, in designing and implementing educational programs. Following are ways in which such cooperation can occur:

1. School buildings cannot be expected to hold all the essential and desirable equipment to which students must have access. Use of available community resources should be promoted. For example, industry has capital facilities which can become the classroom, the laboratory and the shop of a quality educational system.
2. The school buildings of the future should provide access to social services which influence the lives of students and their families thus enhancing individual growth and development.
3. Programs which acknowledge the uniqueness of all cultures and celebrate the values and strengths of cultural diversity in our society can be offered by utilizing cultural resources available in organizations outside the schools.

Facilities should be constructed and rented in a way to utilize existing educational resources available in the community.

B. SCHOOL DISTRICT PHILOSOPHY, GOALS, EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS:

GOAL #6. The School District Should Encourage The Active Participation Of Parents And Other Community Members In The Governance* Of Schools And The Development Of School Programs.

*The committee defines governance to be "to strongly influence the direction of . . ."

Education has been improved where the expectations and concerns of the parents for the welfare of students have been strongly expressed and acted upon. In addition to their contribution in the governing of the schools, the parents and the community need to be directly involved in the development of a quality school program, serving as resources and broadening the base of communication between the schools and the city.

Parents, children and community members should be involved in planning of school construction and renovation.

(II. Long-Range Goals - cont'd)

- GOAL #7. The School District Should Provide Facilities That Have The Capability Of Housing Educational Programs For Persons Of All Ages, From Early Childhood To Old Age.

The community includes persons of all ages. The school system, if it is to serve the community, must assist in meeting the educational needs of those persons not presently offered by other institutions and agencies. The Minneapolis Public School system presently is engaged in community education. Expansion of this program is foreseen due to increased leisure time and the need for retraining in new vocations and avocations.

To a limited extent, the Minneapolis Public School system is currently engaged in early childhood education. The committee feels that there will be an expansion of programs for pre-school children in the future. The Minneapolis Public School system should have facilities that have the capability of housing programs for pre-school children whether spaces are to be rented by private agencies and other public agencies in accordance with policy 1600 or to provide programs within the Minneapolis Public School system should funding become available to accommodate these programs.

The possibility of cooperative ventures should be considered early in the planning process. Provisions must be made for public and private agencies to participate with the school district in the cooperative funding of new facilities capable of housing educational programs for pre-school and/or senior citizens.

There should be adequate provision of ground level space with easy access for pre-school and/or senior citizen programs.

- GOAL #8. The School District Should Have And Maintain A School System That Is Fully Integrated On A Racial And Socio-Economical Basis.

In 1967, the Board of Education adopted a policy relative to school attendance areas that reads in part, "...it shall be the policy of Minneapolis Special School District No. 1 to make every effort to arrest, reduce and eliminate de facto segregation in the schools." The Human Relations Guidelines were formally approved in 1970 and amended in 1972. The U.S. District Court ruling in May, 1972, maintained that, "It is an uncontroverted fact that the schools of the City of Minneapolis are segregated." This

(II. Long-Range Goals - cont'd)

finding was subsequently followed by a desegregation-integration plan that was adopted by the Board of Education and approved by the U.S. District Court. Efforts of the school district to desegregate and achieve integration have been reviewed by the court on a semi-annual basis.

There is both a legal mandate and a commitment by the Board of Education to consider desegregation/integration as a basic criterion in either closing schools or in building new school facilities. The Citizens' Facilities Committee's long-range recommendation is in agreement with this existing policy. It is the opinion of the committee that emphasis should be placed upon educational program improvement and diversity as a means to achieve desegregation/integration.

The schools should be striving for full integration and nothing less should be considered as being satisfactory.

- GOAL #9. The School District Should Develop A Highly Flexible, Fully Utilized Set Of School Facilities To Accommodate A Changing Population And A Variety Of Programs And Program Delivery System.

During the 1975-76 school year, the Board of Education operated school buildings and related facilities that totaled approximately 8.5 million square feet. Most of this area is used efficiently. As space becomes available with declining enrollment, some of it has been converted to usage that supports the school program. Many of our buildings lack the flexibility to be converted and the result has been inefficient utilization. Over a period of time, the inventory of plant space should be such that it can be utilized effectively with surplus area being kept to a minimum.

All new or renovated facilities should be flexible, convertible and expandable in order to accommodate changes in enrollment, programs and program delivery technology.

- GOAL #10. The School District Should Offer High Quality Special Education Programs To Serve The Needs Of The Exceptional Child.

Special Education in Minneapolis has enabled the school district to serve students with a wide range

(II. Long-Range Goals - cont'd)

of individual differences which had not previously been served. (Special Education must continue to serve this function.) According to the "least restrictive" mandate, students in many special education programs will be housed in regular school facilities in a great many of the schools in the district. This must be done in order to minimize transportation needs and to facilitate the mainstreaming concept. However, some special education students have such highly specialized needs that the programs for these students will require special facilities. These citywide facilities may have to be located in various sections of the school district.

Special Education Programs shall be provided in facilities around the city for those not able to be mainstreamed in regular classrooms. (Exploration should be made of the possibility of these being part of the community facilities.)

- GOAL #11. The School District Should Provide Facilities Designed To Accommodate Access And Use By Physically Handicapped Individuals.

State law requires that new public buildings be accessible by the physically handicapped. Federal law and regulations are also being developed that will further promote the accessibility of facilities. Not only should Minneapolis school facilities comply with the law, but every effort should be made to accommodate the handicapped above and beyond these legal requirements. These measures will allow maximum "mainstreaming" of handicapped populations and use of the schools by senior citizens and other populations unable to surmount physical barriers of ordinary construction.

- GOAL #12. The School District Should Generally Plan For A Program Of More Than One Year In The Same Facility For Each Student.

Planning consistent with the goals of integration (see Goal #8) should assure continuity with respect to programs, the school that a pupil attends and peer group membership. This will enable parents or guardians to be reasonably certain about the location of the school which their youngsters will attend. Continual effort should be directed to developing a process for maintaining program continuity and its evaluation. A variety of organizational patterns are needed in the district and can provide excellent and viable educational programs.

(II. Long-Range Goals - cont'd)

C. EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES:

- GOAL #13. The School District Should Provide Facilities That Adequately House The Instructional Program As Described In Policy Series 6000, Learning/Instruction.

The school district should provide high quality instructional programs for every student to learn and grow mentally. Specialized facilities are necessary for learning in most curriculum areas.

Suitable facilities are necessary for laboratory experiences in science, mathematics, the arts, social studies, English and other languages, and industrial and vocational education.

- GOAL #14. The School District Should Provide Facilities That Enable Every Student To Be Physically Fit And Healthy.

Physical Education facilities should provide for the development of students physically as well as provide a source of enjoyment and recreation. Facilities should enable the development of skills used in individual "lifetime" activities as well as team sports, games and "movement".

The school district should strive to meet the guidelines for physical education as recommended by the State Board of Education.

There is a close relationship between health and physical fitness. Facilities should allow for the preparation and serving of nutritionally sound lunches in pleasant sanitary atmospheres. Such facilities should allow students to plan and prepare balanced menus for their own eating.

There should be adequate space for physical fitness and recreational activities both indoors and outdoors. We would also encourage continuance of joint use with other agencies. Where space is available as part of the school plant or school campus it must be shared and fully utilized by all grade levels and sexes.

There should be adequate space for food service facilities. Each school should have specific room for learning to plan and prepare nutritionally balanced meals.

(II. Long-Range Goals - cont'd)

- GOAL #15. The School District Should Provide Facilities To Centralize Some Programs, Particularly At The Secondary Level. These Facilities Should House Academic As Well As Vocational Programs.

The Minneapolis Public Schools should continue to develop specialized vocational centers which students from all parts of the city can attend for part of the school day. Within financial resources, greater subject matter diversity may be accomplished by utilizing the interests of students systemwide rather than the interests found in a given school, cluster or area. The Board should attempt to provide these specialized courses.

Specialized vocational centers should be developed which students from all parts of the city can attend. Specialized academic centers should be developed to provide greater program diversity.

- GOAL #16. The School District Should Provide Vocational Educational Opportunities For The Diverse Population And The Complex Occupational Needs Found In An Urban Area.

Occupational preparation, career education and career re-education need be consistent with current and anticipated occupational demands. This will require both ongoing program evaluation and the identification of appropriate facilities to accommodate a broad range of subjects. Vocational education facilities must be flexible, convertible and expandible. Special mechanical, electrical and structural considerations will be required. Because of these requirements, it may be desirable to locate some vocational educational programs in non-school settings; thereby, taking advantage of plant, equipment and the environment of industry.

- GOAL #17. Construction, Renovation Or Closure Of School Facilities Should Lead To An Improvement In Program.

The first concern of the Minneapolis Public School system is to provide all children the highest quality education, designed to meet their individual needs and wants. The construction, renovation or closure of facilities should be preceded or at least accompanied by foreseen program improvements.

(II. Long-Range Goals - cont'd)

- GOAL #18. In All New Construction Or Major Renovations Of Existing School Facilities Attention Should Be Given To Environmental Factors.

The impact of proposed school facilities upon neighborhood and community environments is an important planning consideration. Even though environmental assessment and environmental impact statements may not be required, the many considerations in these statements should be taken into account early in the planning process.

School building architectural design should contribute positively to the appearance and setting of its immediate surroundings.

- GOAL #19. The School District Should Provide Facilities Designed And Situated So As To Be As Efficient As Possible In The Consumption Of Energy Resources.

Modern society faces shortages of energy resources that are necessary for the construction and operation of school facilities. Shortages will drive the prices of these resources upwards leading to increased operating costs and possible shutdowns. Proposed new facilities and modification of existing facilities should be designed to conserve the use of energy and to utilize less expensive energy resources of the future.

- GOAL #20. As Plans Are Developed For The Construction Of New Educational Facilities Or For The Major Renovation Of Existing Facilities Attention Should Be Given To The Overall Efficiency And Cost Effectiveness Of The Facilities.

School district operating funds must be expended in a manner that enhances the relationship between educational program and facilities. Annual maintenance expenditures can soon "out-weigh" the savings obtained from the poor selection of materials and equipment. A value analysis must be an important consideration in the final selection of supplies, equipment and material items.

Plant planning and construction decisions must be made only after a careful review of cost implications to the school district.

III. PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR MAKING SCHOOL BUILDING DECISIONS

A. Procedures

Due to changing patterns of land use, declining and shifting enrollments, educational and structural obsolescence, life safety concern, along with needed economy in educational costs, it is necessary to conduct a periodic evaluation of each school building.

Changes in the future utilization of school facilities may arise from: (a) action by the Board of Education, (b) requirements of the Board of Education by other supervising agencies, and (c) requests by citizen groups.

The decision to abandon, replace or significantly modify a school plant should be consistent with the following statements:

1. All reviews of school buildings shall be in accordance with published criteria for evaluating the building's adequacy.
2. All school plants shall undergo a periodic staff review at least once every three years.
3. Public notice shall be given whenever a facility is considered for either major change or abandonment by the Board of Education.
4. A citizens committee and a staff review of the facility and the effects of the proposed change of usage should be made prior to a public hearing.*
5. The Board of Education shall give citizens and groups an opportunity to present their views on proposed facility changes. A hearing shall be conducted on the proposal within 90 days of the public notice so that full and undivided attention can be given the matter.
6. Any decision to close a school building and upgrade a receiving school to accommodate new programs must be made no later than the second regular Board meeting in May. One full school year must be available after this decision for planning, staff identification and preparation, and facility modernization before the school is closed.

School buildings should not be closed during the school year except when:

- a. Students are being moved to a new or modernized building.
- b. A building must be immediately abandoned because of unsafe conditions or catastrophe.
- c. Unforeseen conditions preclude its continued use.

(III. Procedures and Criteria - cont'd)

*A type of citizens committee under the 1976 administrative organization might be composed of at least three citizens from each of the three Areas in the District and these area representatives would communicate and work with the Area Advisory Councils to broaden the base of representation. Area representatives should be selected by Area Advisory Councils with the approval of the Area Superintendent. Representation from the school under consideration should be included on the committee. This citizens' committee would be responsible to the Superintendent of Schools. The Director of Facilities and Plant Planning would be an advisor and resource to the committee.

B. Criteria

It has been noted in the preceding section that reviews of school buildings are to be in accordance with published criteria. The four major requirements that must guide building decisions include the necessity to meet life safety standards, integration requirements, city comprehensive plan goals and the objectives of the Long-Range Educational Facilities Plan.

It is the intent that all facilities eventually satisfy the four major requirements. Other criteria need to be evaluated in the making of building decisions. These include, but are not limited to:

1. Educational Program
2. Community Needs
3. School Sites
4. Structural Adequacy
5. Health/Environment Adequacy
6. Operational and Maintenance Costs
7. Transportation

Any instrument designed to measure these criteria should be usable by staff and others. It should also contain measureable elements within each criteria, and enable consistency and comparability between evaluations. Attachment A is an example of a facility evaluation form developed by members of the Citizens' Facilities Committee.

IV. PHYSICAL PLANT DATA

The Minneapolis Board of Education has been building replacement schools in order to provide new, modern and safe facilities rather than schools to accommodate an enrollment increase. For all practical purposes, the City of Minneapolis has been "built up" for the past decade and little area has been available for large housing developments. This situation was different from suburban areas that underwent rapid demographic changes resulting in increased housing construction and consequently rapid school enrollment increases.

Minneapolis has had a Continuous Building Program Since 1964

In January, 1964, district patrons approved their first school building program with a referendum approval of 18 million dollars to be augmented by five years of legislative authorized annual bonding of 2 million dollars. Since that date, an additional 50 million dollars in bonding has provided for new projects at Hamilton, Bethune, Holland, Putnam, Lyndale, Laura Ingalls Wilder, Seward, Franklin, South, North, North Star Community School, Anwatin, Hans Christian Andersen, Victory Memorial Ice Arena, Nutrition Center and Webster. Additions have been constructed onto the following schools: Willard, Bancroft, Mann, Agassiz, Fulton, Kenwood, Sheridan, Phillips, Southwest, Roosevelt, Washburn, Edison and Central. In addition to these projects, modernization at an annual average of 125,000 square feet of floor space has been funded through the bond program. This average does not include painting and roofing programs.

Special School District No. 1 Operates A Variety Of Facilities

Presently, the Minneapolis School District operates 64 elementary and special schools as well as 23 secondary schools. The secondary schools can be listed as 13 middle and junior high buildings and 10 senior high school buildings. Grade organization varies throughout the district; therefore, a considerable difference exists between the grade structure of similarly classified schools. In addition to the 87 school buildings, the district also operates the Miller Vocational School, the Lehmann Educational Service Center, Transportation Center, Victory Memorial Ice Center, Nutrition Center, Educational Service Center and the North Basic Skills Center. A limited amount of leased space is also provided for a number of educational and support programs.

School Building Ages Can Be Identified as Either "Basic" or "Average"

Frequently, a school building's age is identified by the construction date of the oldest portion of the building (basic age) even though later additions were placed onto the building. One of the procedures to arrive at a more meaningful "age" of a facility is known as its "average age". This procedure is an identification of the age of the spaces assigned as regular classrooms and averaging these ages for the building. Age comparisons are then possible between buildings taking into account the varying dates of classroom construction. Tables 1, 2 and 3 are presentations of physical plant data based upon the two concepts of age; namely, basic and average age.

PHYSICAL PLANT DATA

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

TABLE 1

School	Building Construction Dates	Age as of January 1976		Life Safety Rating	Site (Acres)	
		Basic Age	Average Age		School	Park
Harrison	1884, 97	92	57	5 *	9.11	7.11
Bremer	1913, 60					
	1887, 97	89	75	5	3.62	
	1910, 16					
Madison	1887, 89	39	88	5	1.7	1.54
Holmes	1890	86	84	5	1.42	2.71
Pratt	1898, 1906, 26	78	64	4	1.1	
McKinley	1902, 11, 18	74	65	4	2.20	
Lake Harriet	1906, 08, 11	70	68	4	1.58	
Penn	1907, 14	69	64	5	2.64	
Pillsbury	1907, 08	69	62	4	2.63	
Kenwood	1908, 23, 66	68	44	5 **	1.78	
Marcy	1908	68	68	5	1.26	
Willard	1910, 20	66	62	4	5.8	
Tuttle	1911, 26	65	59	3	2.52	
Bancroft	1912, 20, 66	64	63	3	3.6	
Barton	1915, 23, 73	61	61	4	1.95	
Fulton	1915, 22, 66, 70	61	48	2	3.71	
Lowry	1915, 70	61	61	4	8.43	5.39
Ericsson	1916, 51	60	47	3	4.05	
Hiawatha	1916, 23	60	57	3	8.24	4.10
Longfellow	1918	58	58	3	3.82	
Field	1920, 23, 64	56	40	2	3.72	
	1971, 74					
Standish	1920, 23	56	56	3	3.23	
Windom	1920, 23, 25	56	55	3	3.88	
Agassiz	1922, 66	54	48	2	2.25	
Cooper	1923, 58	53	47	3	3.75	
Jefferson	1923	53	53	4	3.50	
Lincoln	1923	53	53	5	7.82	
Northrop	1923, 50	53	38	3	3.56	
Audubon	1924, 55	52	40	2	3.64	
Free School	1924	52	52	4	2.24	
Burroughs	1926, 62	50	39	4	8.26	

* Old portion only which contains no pupils. New portion carries a #4 rating

** Old portion of facility only; new portion carries a #1 rating. Pupils occupy the building.

TABLE 1, Page 2

Approved by Board of
Education 11-30-76

School	Building Construction Dates	Age as of January 1976		Life Safety Rating	Site (Acres)	
		Basic Age	Average Age		School	Park
Emerson	1926	50	50	4	2.01	
Cleveland	1927	49	49	3	3.64	
Howe	1927	49	49	3	3.20	
Loring	1928	48	48	3	4.58	
Keewaydin	1928	48	48	3	8.26	4.13
Minnehaha	1928	48	48	3	3.73	
Hale	1930, 38, 54, 1974	46	34	3	3.55	
Dowling	1936, 61	40	40	1	20.1	
Lind	1937, 50, 54	39	32	3	16.6	8.0
Morris Park	1939, 53	37	31.7	3	6.61	3.88
Waite Park	1950	26	26	1	14.5	8.3
Armatage	1952, 54, 56	24	23.6	2	22.9	18.6
Wenonah	1952, 58	24	24	3	3.64	
Kenny	1954, 57	22	21	3	8.92	4.70
Page	1958	18	18	2	3.0	
Shingle Creek	1958, 59	18	17.6	1	4.18	58.9
Hall	1960, 63	16	14.9	1	5.50	
Putnam	1966	10	8	1	2.24	24.7
Seward	1966	10	8	1	4.12	9.8
Hamilton	1967	9	9	1	4.10	
Bethune	1968	8	8	1	2.70	12.2
Holland	1968	8	8	1	3.20	
Lyndale	1971	5	5	1	3.08	
Webster	1974	2	1	1	11.0	2.8
Wilder (3 schools)	1975	1	1	1	6.2	65.5
North Star (2 schools)	1976	0	0	1	8.0	Boys Club
Andersen (4 schools)	1976	0	0	1	6.5	6.0

Basic Age of Plant: Range - 0 to 92 yrs.

City Average - 45 yrs.

Basic Age of Classrooms: Range - 0 to 88 yrs.

City Average - 40 yrs.

School Owned Site: Range - 1.10 to 22.90 acres

City Average - 5.08 acre

Note: The Citizens Committee has requested that the fire marshall provide it with information on how to improve the life safety rating of each #5 rated building. This information will be published when received.

PHYSICAL PLANT DATA

JUNIOR HIGH AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS

TABLE 2

(In order of Basic Age)

School	Building Construction Date	Age of Plant as of January, 1976	Life Safety Rating	Site (Acres)	
				School	Park
Nckomis	1920	56	4	3.6	
Jordan	1922	54	4	4.9	
Bryant	1923	53	4	6.3	
Phillips	1926	50	4	6.3	
Sanford	1926	50	4	3.7	
Ramsey	1931	45	4	6.9	
Folwell	1931	45	4	3.6	
Sheridan	1932	44	4	3.7	
Olson	1957	19	1	7.0	
Anthony	1958	18	2	6.0	4.7
Anwatin	1960	16	1	28.8	
Northeast	1962	14	1	5.5	
Franklin	1971	5	1	8.5	

I-21

24

Basic Age of Plant

Range: 5 to 56 years

City Average: 36 years

School Owned Site

Range: 3.6 to 28.8 acres

City Average: 7.3 acres

PHYSICAL PLANT DATA

SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

TABLE 3

(In order of Basic Age)

<u>School</u>	<u>Building Construction Date</u>	<u>Age of Plant as of January, 1976</u>	<u>Life Safety Rating</u>	<u>Site (Acres)</u>	
				<u>School</u>	<u>Park</u>
West	1907	69	4	7.0	
Central	1913	63	5	9.2	
Edison	1922	54	4	7.6	
Roosevelt	1922	54	4	10.4	
Marshall-U	1924	52	4	8.4	6.9
Washburn	1925	51	3	10.1	
Henry	1926	50	4	15.2	
Southwest	1940	36	3	11.6	
South	1970	6	1	12.5	
North	1973	3	1	15.8	

Basic Age of Plant (High Schools)
Range: 3 to 69 years
City Average: 44 years

School Owned Site:
Range: 7.0 acres to 15.8 acres
City Average: 10.8 acres

V. FISCAL RESOURCES FOR LONG-RANGE CAPITAL OUTLAY NEEDS

The total amount of money for construction purposes available through the bonding procedure is limited by Minnesota statute. When the school district became independent in 1959, Minnesota statutes contained the provision that "the school district shall not be subject to a net debt of 10 percent of the assessed value of all taxable property therein." Although assessment definitions have changed since the original law was approved, the bonding capacity of the school district has remained relatively stable at approximately \$41,000,000. It should be noted, that this capacity to bond for school purposes is relatively low when compared to suburban districts. For example, Osseo, MN, which has a much smaller enrollment and valuation is authorized about the same capacity to bond for school construction as Minneapolis. For all practical purposes the Minneapolis School District has remained at its capacity to bond for the past six years.

School Bonding Represents a Relatively Small Percentage of the Total City Indebtedness

Generally, in outstate areas the bonded debt of the school district will represent about 75% of a community's total bonded indebtedness. In the city of Minneapolis, the maximum legal capacity to bond for school construction represents only about 19% of the total city debt (1975) and 15% of the city debt plus its share of the county indebtedness (1975). A relatively small percentage of the total area bonded indebtedness is used for school purposes. School bonds in Minneapolis are generally retired in 10 years while 30 years is the usual retirement period in outstate areas.

A Number of Sources for Funding School Construction Exists

State law provides that the school district may issue referendum bonds upon approval of 53 percent of the electors voting on the question. The amount approved must be within the capacity of the school district to bond unless specifically excluded by law. The only exclusion to date has been the authorization to construct area vocational technical institutes. On November 5, 1974, Minneapolis voters approved the sale of referendum bonds in the amount of \$14,475,000 to construct a Minneapolis Area Vocational Technical Institute (MAVTI). These bonds were sold for that purpose in the spring of 1976.

By statute, the school district is also allowed to sell bonds in each calendar year in an amount not to exceed 1/2 of one percent of its assessed valuation. Bonds sold under this statute must not push the indebtedness of the district beyond its legal capacity to bond. Approximately \$2,250,000 per year is available under this provision.

Since 1970, the legislature has allowed the school district to sell bonds in varying amounts not to exceed the amount of bonds retired. Between 1970 and 1974, the district could sell bonds equal to the FULL amount retired; however, from 1975 through 1979, the district can sell bonds only to the extent of 75% of those retired, referred to as the "Three-quarter Bill". This provision enables the school district to sell about \$5,000,000 in bonds each year. Bonding under this statute is subject to capacity limitations.

(V. Fiscal Resources - cont'd)

Another source of building funds is the "capital outlay levy." Current legislation allows the school district to annually levy \$75 per pupil unit for capital outlay purposes. In 1975, the 76,000 pupil units provided about \$5,100,000. Of this total, \$2,500,000 is directed toward the repair and maintenance department, \$900,000 toward equipment purchases including computer leasing (1975 authorization) and \$1,700,000 for school building purposes.

The estimated building fund income from these sources is presented in Table 4. Annual incomes from capital outlay sources which is computed from enrollment figures is expected to decline with enrollment from \$1,700,000 in 1975 to \$1,500,000 estimated for 1979. The annual bond sales are expected to remain at about \$2,250,000 which reflects little anticipated change in total assessed valuation through 1979. Income from the "Three-quarter Bill" will decrease as the school district is retiring fewer bonds during the period. Over \$42,000,000 in income from bond sales is anticipated during the five year period of which projects now in either construction or active planning will require \$16,000,000 to fund. Uncommitted funds to be available beginning in 1977 will approximate \$26,000,000. Funding after 1979 will depend upon enrollment trends (capital outlay determinant), assessed valuation trends (annual bonding determinant), and action by the state legislature to continue approvals of supportive bills like the "Three-quarter Bill".

Building Fund Uses Are Defined By Law

State law provides that the proceeds from the sale of construction bonds and the capital outlay levy shall be used "only for the rehabilitating, remodeling, expanding and equipping of existing school buildings and for the acquisition of sites, construction and equipping of new school buildings and for acquisition and betterment purposes, and no part of such proceeds shall be used for maintenance." School construction projects funded by the capital levy must be approved by the State Commissioner of Education. The legislature reviews the capital levy at each session and authorizes specific non-construction projects to be funded, such as data processing, hardware, etc.

Funds derived from the sale of construction bonds cannot be used for operational costs, general fund purposes and leasing of school facilities. Funds from the annual capital outlay levy may be used for leasing subject to approval of the lease by the State Commissioner of Education.

A Number of Alternatives for Funding Capital Projects Exists

Legal bonding limitations, difficulties in obtaining voter approval of bonds, and the economy have recently had the effect of reducing school construction in general throughout the county. In order to continue to meet the pressing demands of changes in education and changing expectations of education by the public, a number of diverse methods of funding and/or providing facilities have been tried. These include:

- a. The development of corporations to sell bonds, build and lease back property with an option to purchase to the school district.
- b. The acquisition of surplus property from other public agencies including the federal government.

(V. Fiscal Resources.- cont'd)

- c. The joint usage of space by private enterprise and public agencies.
- d. The joint usage of space by public agencies.
- e. Developing "found space" in buildings not usually identified as schools such as warehouses, depots, etc.
- f. Leasing space on a short-term and/or long-term basis either on an annual or prepaid basis.
- g. Increasing use of existing facilities by doubling shifts, night high school, zero hours, four quarter year, etc.

TABLE 4

ESTIMATES OF BUILDING FUND INCOME THROUGH 1979¹Approved Board of
Education 11-30-76

(Bonds and Capital Outlay)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Capital Outlay Funds³</u>	<u>Annual Bonding Authorized</u>	<u>Subtotal</u>	<u>Three- Quarters Bill</u>	<u>Total</u>
1975	\$ 1,700,000	\$ 2,275,000	\$ 3,975,000 ²	\$ 5,100,000	\$ 9,075,000
1976	1,700,000	2,250,000	3,950,000 ²	5,025,000	8,975,000
1977	1,500,000	2,250,000	3,750,000	4,800,000	8,550,000
1978	1,500,000	2,250,000	3,750,000	4,500,000	8,250,000
1979	<u>1,500,000</u>	<u>2,250,000</u>	<u>3,750,000</u>	<u>4,050,000</u>	<u>7,800,000</u>
TOTALS	\$ 7,900,000	\$ 11,275,000	\$ 19,175,000	\$ 23,475,000	\$ 42,650,000 ⁴

- Figures do not include the MAVTI referendum bonds for \$14,475,000.
- These funds are earmarked through 1976 to complete projects currently under construction.
- Capital outlay funding assumes similar distribution and usage as currently exists and includes only the construction portion of the capital outlay funds available.
- Earmarked and possibly earmarked funds during the period 1975-79:

Total amount available \$42,650,000

1975 and 1976 funds needed for
projects under construction 7,925,000

BALANCE \$34,725,000

1976 and 1977 funds needed
for projects now being drawn by
architects 8,000,000

UNCOMMITTED FUNDS (Estimate) \$26,725,000

INFORMATIONAL ATTACHMENT A

FACILITY EVALUATION FORM

Approved by Board
Education 11-30-76

Evaluation Directions: Score each criterion as follows - maximum deficient building = -5;
average building = 0; ideal conditions = +5.

CRITERIA I. Basic Criterion

Scale

Points

To what extent:

-5 0 +5

A. are there major "life-safe" defects within the existing building which require correction?

| | | | | | | | | | | |

B. do the existing and future land use patterns indicate that this is a desirable location for a school building?

| | | | | | | | | | | |

C. is the facility consistent with the District's educational facility plan?

| | | | | | | | | | | |

D. is the existing school building desirable for desegregation and integration because of its location or facilities?

| | | | | | | | | | | |

(This criteria may or may not be an issue for a specific school building.)

I-27

CRITERIA II. Program Criteria

To what extent:

A. can current and anticipated program needs be accommodated?

| | | | | | | | | | | |

B. are educational resources limited/inefficient?

| | | | | | | | | | | |

C. is staffing available and willing to be trained?

| | | | | | | | | | | |

CRITERIA III. Community Needs Criterion

To what extent:

A. are there desirable alternative uses for the existing school building and/or site?

| | | | | | | | | | | |

33

34

- B. would the relocation of the facility and the conversion of the existing site (park, residential, etc.) contribute to the improvement of the quality of life?
- C. does the facility serve significant non-educational community purposes?

-5	Scale										0	+5										Points		

CRITERIA IV. School Site Criteria

To what extent:

is the site of adequate size?

CRITERIA V. Structure Criteria

To what extent:

are there major rehabilitation needs for the existing building?

CRITERIA VI. Health/Safety Criteria

To what extent:

does the building contain unhealthy and/or unsanitary conditions?

CRITERIA VII. Operating/Maintenance Costs Criteria

To what extent:

- A. are the building operating costs (e.g. per pupil and per square foot) comparable to district-wide averages? (e.g. heat, electricity, telephone, water)?
- B. is the building energy efficiency rating (e.g. per pupil) comparable with the district wide average?

-3-

CRITERIA VIII. Transportation Criteria

	<u>Scale</u>	<u>Points</u>	
	-5	0	+5

To what extent:

will students require transportation in terms of cost and time?

CRITERIA IX.

Are there other criteria unique to this school building?

1-29

THE LONG-RANGE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR THE CITY

Paragraphs 1 and 2 of this attachment have previously been reviewed and approved by the Board of Education and the City Planning Commission; however, Paragraph 3, Program Policies: Human Development, has not been reviewed by Cabinet nor previously acted upon by either the Board of Education or the City Planning Commission. This attachment will be reviewed and considered separately at such time as the "Program Policies" are requested by the City Planning Commission.

School Related Components

It is imperative that the Planning and Development staff and school district planning staff coordinate the development of the Comprehensive Municipal Plan of the City of Minneapolis as it affects public school education. Proposed changes in the city "plan" should be approved by the Board of Education as part of its long-range plan. Other long-range developmental plans required by law should also become a formalized component of the school district plan. To date, the following excerpts from the City Comprehensive Municipal Plan pertain to educational facility planning:

1. "Public Educational System Development"

It is recognized that the City of Minneapolis consists of a number of communities each with a degree of uniqueness in character, social composition, potential and limitations. Providing a quality education for all students will involve more than reinforcing healthy local, individual and group values; it will involve the general task of introducing all students to a real understanding of the varied character of our society and the specialized task of encouraging each student to maximize his potential for full constructive participation.

Since a variety of educational programs may be required for significant advances in individual student achievement, the facilities developed to accommodate these programs may require some variations in accepted common service patterns. Such variations should be clearly designed to contend with individual needs with a minimum of disruption of the general educational service pattern and family life. Resident-Parent involvement in the substance of the planning process is taken as a precondition for City Planning Commission approval.

To take full advantage of available land in the development of required facilities for educational programs in general and for such decentralization and satellited facilities as may be necessary, the school system should take full advantage of joint occupancy and leasing.

New school plant construction should be capable of conversion, flexible use or expansion so as to help anticipate, encourage or respond to the demographic changes in the city. Although multistory facilities will normally be constructed, expansion potential both vertical and horizontal, need be given serious consideration to conserve land and maintain the tax base.

a. Elementary Schools

Elementary school improvements should relate not only to their local and area-wide education function but to a role as a focal point for local identity and various human development services.

Although elementary school attendance areas may transcend neighborhood boundaries, their sites should be located to assure a convenient local residential setting for operations and to preserve potentials for a convenient and safe walk to school for those able to do so. Grounds for exception to this policy may include but not be limited to: (a) a unique population, (b) school integration into community setting, (c) program thrust.

Neighborhood playgrounds, where possible, should adjoin elementary schools in a central location for common usage. These facilities should accommodate active, organized, and free play and include playlot areas for very small children. Composition surfaces should be planned carefully with parent involvement so as to minimize injuries.

Outlet and "base" facilities for selected child and home-related health, welfare, and social services should also be centrally located in joint use facilities identified as a neighborhood resource.

b. Secondary Schools

Schools for grades 7, 8 and 9 should accommodate not only multi-neighborhood educational functions but moderately specialized citizen service operations and auxiliary community recreation facilities as well.

When site acquisition economics may dictate a joint elementary-secondary school site for school use, a location at the periphery of several neighborhoods is desirable for optimum local service. Where child or home-oriented social service center needs in adjacent neighborhoods are marginal, joint use of peripheral secondary school facilities would be desirable, preferably in a school-park-social service center.

High schools should be the focus of area-wide young adult education as well as a base for adult human development programs with specific area emphasis. Sites should be located at or near the intersection of major arterial streets and be reasonably accessible by transit. The facility, with adjoining playfield, should be a center for recreational and social programs for youth at a community level and for supplementary or remedial adult education and selective programs for vocational and other training.

c. Ongoing Education

Vocational training and retraining program locations should reflect the area needs for course offerings and potential for "real life laboratory" settings.

Specialized job training facilities for city-wide attendance should be accessible to the commercial or industrial areas of the city, particularly where the activities of the district could also offer on-the-job training or potentials for observing industrial functions.

d. Supplementary Considerations

The cumulative, aggregate effect of facilities, site acquisition, development and disposition programs of public agencies should be to increase, rather than decrease the tax base of the city through demonstrable direct or indirect benefits.

Public agencies shall weigh relocation implications heavily in developing and considering alternative new facility site acquisition and disposition proposals. Moreover, they will be expected to contribute toward equitably meeting the housing inventory needs of the residents who might be displaced by public action.

2. City Planning Goals and Objectives

Objective: Intellectual Development

To cooperatively establish broadly attractive, lifelong opportunities for learning and cultural development, by encouraging and assisting individuals to acquire basic knowledge and skills and by fostering personal creativity and exploration.

Objective: Occupational Development

To so extend and help direct general vocational programs, influence management practices and exert initiatives in selected (industrial promotion and employee support) programs as to be able to equalize employment, advancement and career change opportunities for all individuals and groups in activities which are challenging for personal capabilities, adequate for income attainment and useful society.

3. Program Policies: Human Development

The following are program policies to attain the Human Development--Viable Community Life goal of the Comprehensive City Plan. These policies are those recommended to the Board of Education:

a. Knowledge and Skills

Support programs in the schools which strive for increased individual performance and foster a sense of citizen responsibility to the community and society at large.

Encourage the school systems to use all Minneapolis facilities, including its parks and recreation sites, for basic learning experiences.

Seek an educational system which will encourage open discussion of ideas and consequently provide the student with a broad educational base for life in our society.

Encourage lifelong use of the educational system. Maintain an educational system which is responsive to changes in knowledge due to research, etc.

Assure equal opportunities for education, irrespective of the social, economic or environmental background of the students.

Encourage the multiple use of facilities and program concepts in order to accommodate future population fluctuations.

b. Formal Education

Encourage the implementation of community input into formal education.

Relate day care center scheduling, program content and emphasis to school and preschool programs.

Help design preschool programs to not only develop school readiness skills, but also to facilitate social and cultural adjustments and to extend public health, social services and welfare services.

Coordinate elementary programs with other aspects of service delivery. Develop programs to detect and ameliorate learning and emotional problems in the early school years.

Relate kindergarten programs to preschool programs and encourage flexibility in City kindergarten programs.

Encourage and institute programs to foster the continuing education of high school youths.

Encourage greater student participation in curriculum development at the high school level.

Ensure that all manpower occupational opportunity is incorporated into high school counseling programs.

Increase the availability of counseling services in high problem areas (schools - high drop out, juvenile delinquency, illegitimacies, etc.)

Expand and integrate secondary school programs with other community based social service youth programs.

Secure adequate financing for skilled professional staff and the equipment necessary for quality education.

Encourage diversity in teachers, teaching methods and acceptance of individuality in schools.

Encourage the maintenance of a multi-racial/ethnic teaching staff.

Recognize that the present student to teacher ratio is too high and use the probability of decreasing number of students for establishing a lower ratio.

Encourage liaison between schools and industry to insure opportunities for vocational exploration.

Encourage high school students to attend post-high school educational institutions (e.g., college, universities, Vocational-Technical schools) through an awareness program of curriculum and financial opportunities.

Encourage expansion of existing and alternative school demonstration programs to a city-wide basis and promote the flexibility of curriculum alternatives particularly within the new school complexes.

c. Informal and Supplementary Education

Support basic and remedial educational programs, particularly for recent rural-urban migrants and for the correctional and rehabilitation programs associated with the criminal justice system.

Support the use of libraries as essential to a program of informal education.

Continue and expand the use of neighborhood schools as multi-use facilities for such efforts as recreational programs, adult basic education, continuing education, home skills and leisure time activities classes.

d. Special Education

Support the development and use of special education programs for the retarded, handicapped, the emotionally disturbed, and other behavior-problem children as a part of normal City school programming.

Provide for educational programs to prevent, detect, diagnose and treat visual, hearing, and speech impairments in children and adults and of mental retardation in children.

Support the development and maintenance of rehabilitation facilities and services designed to maintain the optimal level of functioning of the handicapped and physically or mentally impaired children and adults.

e. Staff Development

Improve the retention rate for competent, effective teachers through higher wages and an increased role in curriculum development. Strive to secure adequate financing for the skilled professional staff and for the equipment necessary to secure quality resources for learning.